



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/823,125

03/30/2001

Hernan G. Otero

G08.051

6818

28062

7590

02/04/2009

BUCKLEY, MASCHOFF & TALWALKAR LLC
50 LOCUST AVENUE
NEW CANAAN, CT 06840

EXAMINER

OYEBISI, OJO O

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3696

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/04/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/823,125
Filing Date: March 30, 2001
Appellant(s): OTERO ET AL.

Nathaniel Levin

For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 04/16/07 appealing from the Office action mailed 10/20/06.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

NEW GROUND(S) OF REJECTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter i.e., “a human being.” The broadest reasonable interpretation of applicant’s claimed limitation as a whole encompasses a human being and thus is non-statutory under 35 USC 101.

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

2. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter i.e., “a human being.” The broadest reasonable interpretation of applicant’s claimed limitation as a whole encompasses a human being and thus is non-statutory under 35 USC 101.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. **Claims 1-2, 3, 5 and 8-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(e) as being anticipated by Kane (U.S. Patent 6,317,728).**

Re claim 1: Kane discloses a method for computerized trading comprising:

- A human being using a graphical user interface to enter parameters for a trading algorithm to input a trading order into a logic engine (i.e., decision logic, see abstract, also see “WealthBuilder also allows customer override and entry of trading commands”, col.8 lines 20-36).
- using a first plug-in (i.e., agent) in said logic engine for implementing the trading algorithm (see col. 5, lines 5-10).

Art Unit: 3696

- inputting data for said order into said logic engine (see abstract).
- processing the order with said logic engine, using said plug-in (see abstract).
- executing said order (see abstract)
- said human being monitoring said order in real time by using said graphical user interface (i.e., WealthBuilder also provides a real time internet client allowing users to monitor trade execution and position values held so that a customer can feel connected to the trading environment. The computer makes the decisions but can be monitored remotely, see col.8 lines 20-35).

Re claims 2 and 3: Kane discloses a method wherein the step of inputting a trading order into a logic engine further comprises inputting an order through an ordering system (i.e., data acquisition system, see abstract).

Re claim 5: Kane discloses a method wherein the step of executing said order further comprises outputting said order through an ordering system (col. 3, lines 34-36).

Re claim 8: Kane discloses an apparatus for computerized trading comprising:

- a logic engine for processing trading orders (see abstract);
- an interface to said logic engine to receive from a human being parameters for a trading algorithm(data channel, see fig 1, elements 12, 13) and to allow the human being to monitor said order in real time (i.e., WealthBuilder also provides a real time internet client allowing users to monitor trade execution and position values held so that a customer can feel connected to the trading environment. The computer makes the decisions but can be monitored remotely, see col.8 lines 20-35).

Art Unit: 3696

- a first plug-in (i.e., agent) in said logic engine (i.e., decision logic) for implementing the trading algorithm (see col. 5, lines 5-10). Whereby said logic engine processes order received via said interface (see col. 5, lines 2-11); wherein said logic engine, said interface and said first plug-in are software recorded on a computer-readable medium and capable of execution by a computer.

Re claim 9: Kane discloses an apparatus for computerized trading comprising:

- a logic engine (i.e., decision logic) for processing trading orders (see abstract);
- a first interface (i.e., input) to said logic engine for processing orders from a human being parameters for a trading algorithm (i.e., each decision agents representing a respective buy and a respective sell rule, see abstract) and to allow the human being to monitor said order in real time (i.e., WealthBuilder also provides a real time internet client allowing users to monitor trade execution and position values held so that a customer can feel connected to the trading environment. The computer makes the decisions but can be monitored remotely, see col.8 lines 20-35).
- a second interface (i.e., input) to said logic engine for processing orders (see abstract)
- a first plug-in (i.e., agent) in said logic engine for implementing the trading algorithm (col. 5, lines 5-10). Whereby said logic engine processes orders received via either of said first and second interfaces (see col. 5, lines 2-8, also see abstract); wherein said logic engine, said first interface and said second interface, and said first plug-in are software recorded on a computer-readable medium and capable of execution by a computer.

Art Unit: 3696

Re claim 10: Kane discloses an apparatus wherein said first interface further comprises an Input driver (i.e., agent, see col. 15, lines 5-15).

Re claim 11: Kane discloses an apparatus wherein said second interface further comprises an exchange driver (i.e., agent, see col. 15, lines 5-15).

Re claim 12: Kane discloses an apparatus wherein said first interface (i.e., input) further comprises an interface to an ordering system (see abstract).

Re claim 13: Kane discloses an apparatus wherein said second interface (i.e., input) further comprises an interface to an ordering system (see abstract).

Re claim 14: Kane further discloses an apparatus wherein said logic engine further comprises a Core Processing Area (i.e., central processing unit, see col. 5, lines 5-10).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 4, 6** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kane (U.S. Patent 6,317,728) in view of Microsoft Computer Dictionary (MCD hereinafter: Microsoft Computer Dictionary 5th edition, page 345).

Re claim 4: Kane discloses a method for computerized trading comprising: the steps of processing trading orders (see abstract). Kane does not explicitly disclose a step of de-

Art Unit: 3696

constructing said Complex Order into at least one event and action. However, the method of deconstructing complex order into event/action is old and well known and it a well-taught modular design method in object-oriented modular programming (see Microsoft computer dictionary 5th edition, page 345). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement this well-taught modular design method in Kane to allow programmers to debug and recover very quickly from program crashes.

Re claim 6: Kane discloses a method for computerized trading comprising:

- A human being using a graphical user interface to enter parameters for a trading algorithm to input a ComplexOrder into a logic engine through an ordering system.
- using a first plug-in (i.e., agent) in said logic engine for implementing the trading algorithm (see col. 5, lines 5-10).
- inputting data for said order into said logic engine (see abstract).
- Kane discloses a method wherein the step of executing said order further comprises outputting said order through an ordering system (col. 3, lines 34-36).
- said human being monitoring said order in real time by using said graphical user interface to enter (i.e., WealthBuilder also provides a real time internet client allowing users to monitor trade execution and position values held so that a customer can feel connected to the trading environment. The computer makes the decisions but can be monitored remotely, see col.8 lines 20-35). However, Kane does not explicitly teach the step of deconstructing said complex order into events and actions. The method of deconstructing complex order into event/action is a well-taught modular design in

Art Unit: 3696

object-oriented modular programming (see Microsoft computer dictionary 5th edition, page 345). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement this well-taught modular design method in Kane to allow programmers to debug and recover very quickly from program crashes.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

This examiner's answer contains a new ground of rejection set forth in section **(9)** above. Accordingly, appellant must within **TWO MONTHS** from the date of this answer exercise one of the following two options to avoid *sua sponte* **dismissal of the appeal** as to the claims subject to the new ground of rejection:

(1) **Reopen prosecution.** Request that prosecution be reopened before the primary examiner by filing a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 with or without amendment, affidavit or other evidence. Any amendment, affidavit or other evidence must be relevant to the new grounds of rejection. A request that complies with 37 CFR 41.39(b)(1) will be entered and considered. Any request that prosecution be reopened will be treated as a request to withdraw the appeal.

(2) **Maintain appeal.** Request that the appeal be maintained by filing a reply brief as set forth in 37 CFR 41.41. Such a reply brief must address each new ground of rejection as set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(vii) and should be in compliance with the other requirements of 37 CFR 41.37(c). If a reply brief filed pursuant to 37 CFR 41.39(b)(2) is accompanied by any amendment, affidavit or other evidence, it shall be

Art Unit: 3696

treated as a request that prosecution be reopened before the primary examiner under 37 CFR 41.39(b)(1).

Extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) are not applicable to the TWO MONTH time period set forth above. See 37 CFR 1.136(b) for extensions of time to reply for patent applications and 37 CFR 1.550(c) for extensions of time to reply for ex parte reexamination proceedings.

Respectfully submitted,

/OJO O OYEBISI/

Examiner, Art Unit 3696

Conferees:

/THOMAS A DIXON/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3696

Vincent Millin /vm/

Appeals Practice Specialist

Art Unit: 3696

A Technology Center Director or designee must personally approve the new ground(s) of rejection set forth in section (9) above by signing below:

/Wynn W. Coggins/

Director, TC 3600